



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,097	05/30/2006	Mitsuru Ueda	36856.1440	1870

54066 7590 10/01/2010  
MURATA MANUFACTURING COMPANY, LTD.  
C/O KEATING & BENNETT, LLP  
1800 Alexander Bell Drive  
SUITE 200  
Reston, VA 20191

EXAMINER
----------

CHEN, XIAOLIANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2841

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

10/01/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JKEATING@KBIPLAW.COM  
uspto@kbiplaw.com  
cbennett@kbiplaw.com

<p align="center"><b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	<p><b>Application No.</b> 10/596,097</p>	<p><b>Applicant(s)</b> UEDA ET AL.</p>	
	<p><b>Examiner</b> XIAOLIANG CHEN</p>	<p><b>Art Unit</b> 2841</p>	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 24 September 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Xiaoliang Chen/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2841

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 09-24-10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. Applicant argues that line conductor 26 of Sakai is not a coil conductor pattern

This argument is not persuasive because

1) Sakai disclose that "In the laminate, wiring conductors are arranged so that a desired circuit is defined by passive elements, such as inductors." [0005] and Sakai show in fig. 2 that the conductor pattern 26 is a coil conductor pattern and constitute a coil inductor.

2) "a coil" is different from "a coil conductive pattern" as in the claim.

3) There is no limitation of the coil shape in the claim as in the arguments.

B. Applicant argues that Sakai and Alcoe do not disclose that "the first land in one of the plurality of ceramic sheets is directly and electrically connected to the second land in another of the plurality of ceramic sheets through the via hole formed in the one of the plurality of ceramic sheets"; and "the area of the second land is larger than the area of the first land".

This argument is not persuasive because

1) As states in the rejection that Sakai disclose "the first land in one of the plurality of ceramic sheets is directly and electrically connected to the second land in another of the plurality of ceramic sheets through the via hole formed in the one of the plurality of ceramic sheets" (fig. 2, the connecting land is positioned at an end of the line conductor, i.e., the end of the line conductor is connected to the via-hole conductor [0037]) to obtain a laminate (fig. 2, the ceramic green sheets are laminated together [0017]); and Alcoe teaches "the area of the second land (25, fig 1 and fig. 1A) is larger than the area of the first land (29, fig 1 and fig. 1A)."

2) The reference of Alcoe is used only for teach "the area of the second land is larger than the area of the first land", and Alcoe does not necessary to teach to "the first land in one of the plurality of ceramic sheets is directly and electrically connected to the second land in another of the plurality of ceramic sheets through the via hole formed in the one of the plurality of ceramic sheets" or the other limitations in the claim, since the main reference of Sakai already disclosed the limitation (See response to the arguments B. 1, above).